DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 179 721 CE 023 218

AUTHOR Day, Sherman
TITLE Education and Training in the Criminal Justice System. Implications for Vocational Education R&D. Occasional Paper No. 52.
INSTITUTION Ohio State Univ., Columbus. National Center for Research in Vocational Education.
PUB DATE May 79
NOTE 18p.
AVAILABLE FROM National Center Publications, National Center for Research in Vocational Education, 1960 Kenny Road, Columbus, Ohio 43210 (order no. OC-52: $1.90)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Adjustment (to Environment): *Correctional Education: *Educational Programs: Employment Opportunities: Institutional Personnel: Institutional Role: *Prisoners: *Program Development: *Program Improvement: Social Action: *Staff Improvement: Vocational Counseling: *Vocational Rehabilitation

ABSTRACT

Although there are several fine education and training programs in our nation's correctional institutions, most are substandard. There are two primary reasons for this: the confusion existing in our society over the purposes of imprisonment and the effects of reform on the correctional system. The focus of correction is continually shifting as reform movements exert their influence. Robert Martinson's work, extensively cited and attacked, suggests that "rehabilitation efforts have had very little effect on recidivism." Optional Programming, the policy guiding the Bureau of Prisons' activities, allows optional inmate participation in vocational programs due to the belief that forced attendance may cause resistance. Optional Programming allows inmates to choose from a wide variety of programs with the hope that the chances for successful post-release adjustment will be increased. Continued support for education and training in corrections depends on tying education and training to the work program of the institution. Improvement of educational programs rests in staff education and development, upgrading job qualifications, and improving job benefits and salary. The success of a strong base for education, training, and work in prisons depends on the ability of the staff to recognize its importance. (A series of questions, to which the author responds, relating to employment opportunities, career counseling, and vocational placement are included.) (FP)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED179721

Occasional Paper No. 52

EDUCATION AND TRAINING IN THE CRIMINAL JUSTICE SYSTEM: IMPLICATIONS FOR VOCATIONAL EDUCATION R & D

by

Sherman Day
Dean, College of Education
Georgia State University

The National Center for Research in Vocational Education
The Ohio State University
Columbus, Ohio 43210

May 1979

CE 023 218

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Joel H. Magisos

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

NATIONAL ADVISORY COUNCIL ON WOMEN'S EDUCATIONAL PROGRAMS

Council Members

Chair: Eliza M. Carney
Tempe, Arizona

Vice-Chair: Gladys Gunn
Dayton, Ohio

Marjorie Bell Chambers
Los Alamos, New Mexico

Agnes I. Chan
San Francisco, California

Sister M. Isolina Ferre
Ponce, Puerto Rico

Elizabeth Z. Fryer
Nashville, Tennessee

Jon Fuller
Ann Arbor, Michigan

Ellen Hoffman
Washington, D.C.

Kathleen E. Humphrey
Boise, Idaho

Thera A. Johnson
Ogden, Utah

Anna Doyle Levesque
Portsmouth, Rhode Island

Paul Parks
Boston, Massachusetts

Mary Beth Peters
Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania

J. Richard Rossie
Memphis, Tennessee

Bernice Sandler
Washington, D.C.

Marguerite Selden
Washington, D.C.

Susan Margaret Vance
Chicago, Illinois

Ex Officio Members

Director
U.S. Commission on Civil Rights

Director
Women's Bureau
U.S. Department of Labor

Director
Women's Action Program
U.S. Department of Health,
Education, and Welfare

PREFACE

In its ongoing effort to keep staff informed of current developments in vocational education R&D, the National Center for Research in Vocational Education, The Ohio State University, conducts seminars which feature leaders in various fields of education and related disciplines. The National Center invited Dr. Sherman Day to participate in a seminar on "Education and Training in the Criminal Justice System: Implications for Vocational Education Research and Development."

Eminently qualified to lead such a seminar, Dr. Day's perspective on the topic results from insights gained while serving as Director of the National Institute of Corrections and as Assistant Director of the U.S. Bureau of Prisons. His current position, Dean of the College of Education at Georgia State University, adds another dimension to this perspective.

Day received a bachelor's degree from Brigham Young University, a master's degree from the University of Illinois, and a doctorate of education from the University of Georgia. Day has served as teacher, counselor, professor, and editor, and is the author of several articles and books on corrections.

In his seminar presentation, Day outlines the current status of education and training in corrections and stresses that there are two primary reasons for the lack of success of the current programs: (1) confusion about the purposes of imprisonment, and (2) failure to respond to the need to improve correctional personnel through education and training.

On behalf of the National Center, I take great pleasure in sharing Dr. Day's presentation, "Education and Training in the Criminal Justice System: Implications for Vocational Education Research and Development."

Robert E. Taylor
Executive Director
The National Center for Research
in Vocational Education

EDUCATION AND TRAINING IN THE CRIMINAL JUSTICE SYSTEM: IMPLICATIONS FOR VOCATIONAL EDUCATION R & D

I believe I bring an interesting perspective on the subject of this address. During the past twelve years my career and employment have thrust me into contact with our prison/jail systems, educational systems, as well as institutions of higher education. Thus, I've seen all sides . . . theory and practice. My present position as Dean, College of Education, Georgia State University, brings me into daily contact with leaders in the career/vocational movement. People like Grant Venn and Harmon Fowler of our faculty are continually trying to train and educate me in these areas.

Let me now switch gears and speak to the assigned subject. First, I would like to preface my remarks about training and education in the criminal justice system by saying that I will speak primarily about adult correctional institutions. Second, I want to give you a summary statement about education and training in corrections at the present time. While there exists several fine education and training programs in our nation's correctional institutions, by and large, education and training programs are substandard and in some cases nonexistent.

I would like to point out two primary reasons for the lack of success of education and training in corrections. I am dismissing budgetary reasons, although I am painfully aware of their effect.

One reason for the general lack of success of training and education programs in corrections is the confusion that exists within our society over the purposes of imprisonment.

I' m sure you are aware that corrections is in a continual state of reform. To understand where we are, you must have a feel for where we've been. The reform movements have taken corrections from the Mosaic law, through Quaker influenced penitence, on to the social work dominated "treatment" emphasis to the present concepts of "justice." Indeed, the present reformers' shorthand is characterized by the words "justice and punishment."

The leading writers have captured the spirit of our times. The Guggenheim Foundation report entitled *Toward a Just and Effective Sentencing System;* the Vanden Haig volume, *Punishing Criminals;* Dave Fogel's *Justice Model for Corrections;* Andrew Von Hirch's work entitled *Doing Justice;* the Dersowitz volume, *Fair and Certain Punishment;* and the latest and perhaps most widely read work of Silberman, *Crime and Punishment in the 70's,* all point to the same conclusion: that rehabilitation programs have been ineffective and our efforts for modern day reform are better directed at sentencing. Reformers of previous days who championed the movement for more education, vocational training, counseling, and community involvement have now shifted their emphasis to sentence disparity and parole inequity. The words "punishment," "deterrence," "retribution" and "incapacitation" have achieved new respectability, while terms like "rehabilitation" and "treatment" are bankrupt and programs associated with these ideals such as education and vocational training are fighting for continued support.

Perhaps the disillusionment with rehabilitation originated with an article in *The Public Interest,* Spring 1974, entitled "What Works? Questions and Answers About Prison Reform" by Robert Martinson. Martinson's work, widely cited and miscited, concluded that "with few and isolated exceptions, the rehabilitation efforts that have been reported so far have had no appreciable effect on recidivism." Martinson's writings were enthusiastically received by hardliners within and without corrections who felt the reforms of the past few years were "pampering" criminals. They saw a return to the "good old days." The movement to return to the "good old days" was very dangerous since the "good old days" weren't either good or very long ago.

Martinson's work was attacked by rehabilitation personnel as being old (1945-1967) and thus unworthy of being the basis of any decisions in corrections. Some cited Martinson's work to support the point that few resources have been directed at rehabilitation efforts in corrections, i.e., rehabilitation has really never been tried. Martinson's writings and speeches (usually entitled "Nothing Works") tarnished the previously respected rehabilitation ideal.

It is ironic that, with LEAA funding, Martinson took another look at correctional programs from 1967-1976. By and large, his research showed many programs had positive results. However, it was too late—the tide had changed. Increased crime rates, deteriorating economic conditions, and widespread unemployment have forced every elected official, correctional administrator, funding agency, and private citizen to reexamine the effectiveness of our rehabilitation efforts to date. Even community corrections, the major reform of the middle sixties and early seventies, has failed to survive unscathed. Most officials now admit that community corrections, a concept that promised to empty our nation's bastilles and deinstitutionalize the majority of offenders, was oversold. Community corrections now takes its place along with industrial work, education, vocational training, and counseling as worthwhile alternatives for many offenders but hardly the panacea or millennium correctional reformers promised. As Silberman summarized in *Crime and Punishment in the 70's:*

> After criminals are caught, moreover, there is little evidence that any particular method of responding to them will prevent a recurrence. It is safe to say that no one knows what "rehabilitates" criminals; perhaps the most tantalizing suggestion is simply that, insofar as many violent crimes are committed by young males, crime is "outgrown" as they become older. From this perspective, the best cure for crime is a negative growth rate of population. One ought to object to brutal treatment of criminals, but the objection should stem from a belief in the inherent inhumanity of brutality rather than from an optimistic utilitarianism that sees rehabilitation as the outcome of benign treatment.

The results of the reform movement on education and training programs were mixed. Some systems had few educational programs to reform. Others have made no changes. Many systems have changed program emphasis resulting in loss of support for education and training. One total system, the Bureau of Prisons, modified its previous position in line with new thinking. Previously, in the federal system, education and vocational training were required of all inmates below certain grade levels. Classrooms were filled with students who attended out of requirement rather than choice. The number of inmates engaged in these programs was higher in the past; however, educational and vocational program completions are much higher today. Presently, in the federal system, these programs are optional. Inmates are not required to attend, nor do they get special points from the parole board for completing grade levels or vocational programs. The policy statement that guides Bureau of Prison activities is entitled "Optional Programming." Let me read you a few quotes from this policy:

It is an explicit assumption of the Bureau of Prisons that inmates can increase the likelihood of their making a successful return to the free world community through participation in a variety of education/VT/Federal Prison Industries, Inc., programs. Further, it is generally accepted that coercion fosters resistance toward, rather than acceptance of, the activity being pressed upon the individual. These considerations have led to the development of an "optional programming" concept as the overriding Bureau of Prisons' program philosophy in the education/vocational training and Federal Prison Industries areas.

It is the policy of the Bureau of Prisons to establish and operate safe, humane institutions for the confinement of Federal law violators. During their period of incarceration, prisoners shall have an opportunity to use their time constructively. This entails inmates being able to choose from among a wide variety of quality programs, those which would be most helpful in increasing the likelihood of a successful post-release adjustment in the outside community.

Optional programming does not mean that inmates can remain idle and do nothing constructive for the period of their incarceration. All inmates will have a full program of either work or other structured activities. Optional programming means that after a discussion with the Unit/Classification Team, an inmate can be placed in an appropriate Education/VT/Federal Prison Industries, Inc., program for a period up to 90 days. At the end of this period of time there will be another Unit/Classification Team meeting at which time the inmate can "opt out" without any negative consequences.

It is incumbent upon correctional staff to develop attractive, quality programs which will encourage inmates to remain in activities which will assist in accomplishing their own goals and help them make a successful return to the free world.

I believe that changes in the federal system demonstrate how a system can adjust its thinking and make constructive changes. What was learned from the latest reform? What could we have done differently? What are the implications for those of us in education emerging from the latest reform and seeds for future reference? First, education and vocational training should never be lumped with the exotic "treatment" programs that found fertile ground in our prisons during the sixties. Yet, anyone who has visited a prison knows that there are usually two or three major administrative divisions: security, treatment, and industries or work. Unfortunately, education and training were almost always under "treatment." While I'm not knocking the martial arts, Synanon, group and individual therapy, drug treatment, religious programs, behavior modification, yoga, TM, or any other effort to improve one's lot, I believe that education and vocational training slept with the wrong partners. Educational training should be closely allied with work, earning a living, staying employed, upgrading work skills, and retraining for new work markets.

Make no mistake about it: All citizens of our country understand the importance of work in our society. Most understand the social consequences of not working, including paying for unemployment and all that follows. Work, education, and training are as basic to our society, including the prison society, as maintaining order, eating, and balancing the budget.

Our real efforts in the future should be directed at tying education and training to the work program of the institution. Both work and training will benefit. Our fault as correctional administrators and educators has been in separating education and vocational training from correctional industries and work.

The Texas Department of Corrections (TDC) has come closer to the relationship I suggest than any other total system, with the possible exception of Federal Prison Industries. The records conversion industry at the Wynne Unit of TDC stands out in my mind as the best example of capitalizing on the relationship between training/education and work. Thus, a tour of this unit will allow the observer to see all three components in action. Each time inmates upgrade their education or skill training they upgrade their jobs.

The implications, from my viewpoint are clear. Continued, as well as expanded support for education and training in corrections, rests with out abilities to bring education, training, and work together. In a sense, we are talking about a career educational model that allows individuals to find relevance to their training and education in a "real" work situation.

Grant Venn, of our Georgia State staff, postulates ten assumptions that "kill" vocational education: Number nine is: "Vocational educational institutions do not teach students how to make the transition from skill to work and responsibilities." If ever this assumption could be tested under controlled conditions, a correctional institution is the place.

I have been reading the Clark Kerr volume (1979) entitled *Observations on the Relations Between Education and Work in the People's Republic of China.* This report comes from a study group of leading Americans who recently visited China. The Kerr study group observed several new Chinese policies related to education and work that have served to redevelop that country. These included, among others:

> "Combining training, education and work; and work study programs, such as school three days, application three days."

I see correctional institutions as fertile places for the marriage of training and work to be consummated. Unfortunately, the norm in many institutions is the complete separation of the school and work both physically and psychologically.

The future support for educational and vocational programs will be in our ability to tie them to productive employment.

Let me now switch gears and come to the problem of improving education and training in correctional institutions from an entirely different perspective.

Bruce Jackson recently participated in the Distinguished Lecturer Series at the Criminal Justice Center, Institute of Contemporary Corrections and Behavioral Sciences, Sam Houston University. His presentation was entitled, *The Bureacratic Crisis: Public Institutions. . .Whom Do They Serve?* In his address he pointed out several facts that escape most observers of the correctional system. He talked about the "long-term residents" of institutions and their impact on the programs and operations. He said,

> When I speak of the long-term residents of any institution, I may not mean the people you think. The long termers of most institutions are not the people for whom the institutions were ostensibly built. In a prison, for example, the long termers are not the convicts. Very few people who are sent to a penitentiary stay there for more than four years, but most of the staff are around considerably longer than four years. And most staff workers who are still on the job after four years will continue working in institutions for some time. *They* become the long-term residents.

Any impact on training and education in corrections for inmates will be directly tied to the training and education of the staff, or as Jackson states, the "long-term residents." Thus, a major implication for vocational education R&D is the need to improve training and education for staff, line and administrators. I am now going to paint you a very discouraging picture. Lest you draw the wrong conclusions as to my feeling about correctional staff, let me in advance relay to you my profound respect for the thousands of men and women in our country who are doing their best to "run" our prison institutions. However, the fact remains that few resources are being directed to the improvement of correctional personnel through education and training. Further, those that are being directed are often ineffective. I'll come back to the ineffective part later.

Perhaps the reason the National Institute of Corrections has achieved a measure of success in corrections stems from its recognition that the most neglected persons in corrections are the "long-term residents," or staff.

A look at the national picture will tell the story. We have no national system of criminal justice, and certainly not in corrections. As a matter of fact, the federal, state, city, and local agencies are extremely independent—without central control or standards. (The courts have assumed some authority for uniformity and the American Correctional Association Accreditation Commission is making a gallant effort to assure minimums.) To verify this point, look at salaries for correctional workers. A 1977 survey from *Corrections Management* reveals that state salaries range from $6,000 to $15,744. I'm sure these figures have improved numerically, and decreased in spending power. In most states, the starting salary for correctional workers is below that for police officers, sanitation workers, and school janitors. Thus, turnover is extremely high (Louisiana, 74 percent; Montana, 60 percent; New Mexico, 65 percent; Vermont, 63 percent).

Let's turn to education and training. The following figures will point to the problems. First, eleven states still have no entrance requirements for correctional workers. Twenty-five percent of the states have no training program for correctional staff, and another 38 percent provide less than forty hours (this says nothing about quality). Very few states have maintained training for staff beyond the expiration of federal monies.

Perhaps you are aware of the recent (1978) "Bennis" report dealing with higher education programs in the police area. The report entitled "The Quality of Police Education," or as *The Chronicle of Higher Education* chose to call it, "Going Beyond Handcuffs, 101," is extremely critical of higher education programs in criminal justice. The commission found that college level police education is, in the words of Warren Bennis " . . . a rip off." Education for the police officer is somewhere between that of manual laborer and a paraprofessional—officers are given very rudimentary skills, yet they are confronted with very complex problems. Norval Morris, a member of the commission, stated, "We want police officers to find through education new methods for coping with crime and providing Sound Justice . . . Ideally, we would like to see our policemen with four years of college in all areas of study. . .a broadly based education."

While I have switched gears on you and spoken of the police training, I'm sure you understand that correctional personnel engaged in education have by and large been trained (educated) in these identical programs. They also have been "ripped off."

Let me summarize this section with some observations. First, we will not be successful in achieving better education and training of inmates until we address the staff education and training issue. Some agencies have been successful. I believe the federal prison system, under Norm Carlson, has given great emphasis to staff developments. The National Institute of Corrections has seen

staff development as a primary focus and been responsible for many programs in this area. Some have been developed with the help of National Center staff. Several states have likewise tried to address the issue; however, limited monies, ballooning inmate populations, and lack of appreciation for staff have placed this priority way down the list.

Why are we talking about staff when the subject is education and training in corrections? Since many of you have not worked in a prison, the answer may not be as obvious as it is to me. Security should and does dominate our institutions. Thus, the success of any educational or vocational program will depend on its ability to work within this framework. The success of a solid framework that includes opportunities for education, training, and work is tied to the ability of line staff and management to recognize its importance. This recognition, in turn, is a function of education and training. It is tied to their ability to see the large picture—to envision success as more than keeping escapes and riots down, and balancing the budgets. Their ability to envision the role education and training and work habits will play on the future "street" success of each inmate is directly related to their own education and training.

I hope I've made my point, but let me again remind you that my hat goes off to the thousands of persons operating our institutions. These staff work with inmates, many of whom have twisted logic, lack self-control, display misplaced values, and fail to take responsibility for their own actions.

In summary, corrections is a complicated business. Even at the best, correctional institutions cannot succeed where the rest of the society has failed. We cannot take offenders and overcome a lifetime of failure. Training and education alone cannot be expected to offset the effects of broken families, the decline in religious belief and training, the loss of authority in our schools, and the general slackening of self-discipline in our increasingly urban and compartmentalized society. However, we have far to go in improving fundamental problems associated with corrections. It is my contention that increased emphasis on the training and education of staff, and better coordination of education and training with work programs will greatly enhance our prison system.

Let me invite you to become involved in correctional activities. Visit your federal, state, and local institutions. I am sure you will have much to offer in the improvement of the education and training opportunities available to those incarcerated in our nation's prisons.

Thank you for inviting me.

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS

Question: Is vocational training in correctional institutions attempting to match people with existing jobs?

Yes, there are two or three national efforts, and several local efforts. The Small Business Administration and the National Business Alliance are very active in seeking jobs and placing offenders. John Amore, who has been here at the National Center, heads that program nationally. John is an ex-offender. He is very active in convincing business to hire ex-offenders. That program is having some success; however, while it is working quite well in the metropolitan population centers, it is not as effective in other areas. It is as recent as 1975 or 1976 that these organizations put full-time people on these projects. In addition, correctional people are attempting to work with the trade unions to make several vocational programs apprenticeship programs. These efforts are beginning to creep into our institutions. These programs provide a direct avenue to jobs, as the trade unions will place offenders after completion.

Question: What difference is vocational training making in terms of recidivism? Is recidivism being reduced?

I have been asked this question many times, including at congressional hearings. Recidivism is such an elusive concept that it is extremely hard to respond to such questions. I would not tie the success of vocational education programs to recidivism. There is no question but that jobs tie to successful reentry to our society. For instance, Collin Frank, a Washington D.C. psychologist, completed a study on the federal system that indicates quite clearly that increases in federal prison populations are directly related to unemployment statistics. The curves run thirteen months behind. As unemployment escalates, prison populations escalate some thirteen months later. That tells you how long it takes to go through the criminal justice system. Back to your question--recidivism is a very difficult concept to get at for a couple of reasons. One reason is that we have no way to get good data. Ellis McDougald has been the commissioner of Connecticut, South Carolina, Georgia, Mississippi, and Arizona in the last ten years. His employment history illustrates one of the problems that I did not address—i.e., the lack of stability at the top levels of correctional administration. When he was commissioner of Georgia he testified before our house appropriations committee, dominated by a man named "Sloppy" Floyd, a legend in his own time. I recall that in the hearings Mr. Floyd asked Ellis, "What is your recidivism rate?" And Ellis, who had only been in Georgia a few months said, "Mr. Chairman, we believe that our programs are 80 percent effective." Mr. Floyd replied, "Hey Mr. McDougald, are you going to come before this committee knowing the national statistics are around 50 percent and tell us your programs are 80 percent effective? I would like you to prove it." And Ellis calmly said, "Can you prove that they are not?" There is no way to prove it. Ellis could examine how many people came back in to the Georgia institutions, but he had no idea how many had been arrested in South Carolina; how many were awaiting sentencing in the county jail; or how many had committed a federal crime.

There is also another point to be made. We must ask ourselves this question, "Can you deal with a lifetime of failure, regardless of circumstances, and correct that failure by completing a welding course?" In other words, "Can you hold a welding course responsible for insuring that a

thirty-three year-old, who has had multiple failures in our society, will not fail again? It's an unfair test. Basically the point I'm trying to make is that correctional institutions can't be held responsible for the recidivism rate of the offenders. The correctional institution controls the offender's life for only a few months or years.

The only group that I know that has generated pure national statistics on recidivism is the Bureau of Prisons. In the federal system the statistics would indicate that after two years 33 percent recidivate. And eventually another 13 percent recidivate. So after several years, you've got about a 50 percent recidivism rate. However, there's folly in this report also. Is it fair to hold the Bureau of Prisons responsible for offenders' lives two years after they leave their institutions? The correctional institution should be responsible for providing opportunities to better oneself, including vocational education. Then the person has to take responsibility for himself/herself. In short, the recidivism statistics are very elusive. It's almost like proving a person can drown in a stream with an average depth of two inches. The critical implication is that the basic programs, i.e., education and vocational training, ought to stand on their own weight as inherent rights in our society. They provide the axis point to greater opportunities. We should not tie these basic programs to recidivism; rather we should tie them to basic human goals that should be inherent in a democratic society. Now if you want to milk it politically, you can talk about potential employment; you can talk about not being on welfare, or you can talk about the costs to taxpayers. However, you can't hold a one-year welding program totally accountable for reforming an adult who's been in and out of prison several times.

Question: Doesn't the recidivism rate depend on the whole criminal justice system? Aren't we, in a sense, creating "smarter" criminals through vocational training so that it's hard to depend on the recidivism rate?

There is vocational training and other types of training going on in institutions whether or not it's under the auspices of correctional administration. If you want a job as a bookmaker or a drug runner, you can receive "peer" training in institutions. As far as legitimate programs are concerned, there are not enough nor enough of sufficient quality. Legitimate programs do not create "smarter" criminals in the sense you imply in your question.

Question: Is there career counseling in correctional institutions?

On paper every inmate has a caseworker. That caseworker supposedly is counseling that person, i.e., taking care of the individual inmate's case. The caseworker helps prepare the person to go before the parole board and plan for release. The duties may include helping the inmate find a job, or might involve helping the inmate write a plan for study after release. In reality, caseworkers are so overworked that these efforts are very inconsistent; it's not career counseling as you and I would like it to be, and for many people it doesn't have much meaning.

Another related point is the fact that most caseworkers are seen by inmates as having almost a life and death hold over their release. What they say positively or negatively can affect the parole board. As a result, oftentimes there is not the kind of relationship between the inmate and the caseworker that you would like to see in a good career counseling model. This does not mean that counseling does not take place. I could take you with me on a tour of the Atlanta Federal Penitentiary. It is the institution I know best since I've worked there for twelve years. I can show you people who have the title "psychologist" on their door. I can show you people who have the title "educator" on their door. I can show you people who have the word "chaplain" on their door. I can show you other persons who might be officers, or as you know them "guards." Inmates choose

the man or woman, not the titles. The labels really don't mean a lot in terms of seeking out career counseling. I'm thinking of one officer right now that I have known for years; he's retired now. He had more impact on the people's lives in that institution than anybody I knew. He was a common correction officer who just came to work with his lunch pail every day. He had an inordinate amount of common sense, a lot of empathy, and the right amount of firmness. I suspect he still gets a lot of letters from inmates. He was an excellent career counselor.

Question: What do statistics on the employment rate of ex-inmates reveal about the attitude of prospective employers?

The statistics would indicate that there is a large number of ex-offenders that are not employed and have a hard time getting a job. Because they are ex-offenders, finding employment is harder. In some states it is worse than in others. Let me give you an illustration. When Jimmy Carter was the governor of Georgia, he hired a professional corrections person to lead our state. Prior to that time the corrections system was dominated by politics. Jimmy Carter was interested in corrections personally, and under his administration a lot of money was placed in our correctional system. In spite of the fact that he lobbied hard, our state government did not employ ex-offenders. Now that's the dichotomy that exists in many states. The state will do everything that it can to rehabilitate inmates, but it won't allow inmates to be employed in state positions.

Question: Is there any hope?

Yes, many states hire ex-offenders. Some states have affirmative action programs that include ex-offenders as well as the handicapped and minorities. And there are several good employment programs. Some labor departments, under the auspices of the U.S. Labor Department, developed massive employment projects for ex-offenders. The labor unions, especially the trade unions, have been more active recently in setting up apprenticeship programs that allow direct linkage to jobs. But again, it would be a misconception to give you an idea of a large volume of inmates participating in those programs.

Question: I have the sense that in some respects the Canadian system is more progressive than the American system. Would you comment on that?

Yes, I will comment on the Canadian system. I don't know whether I would say that it is better. It has some advantages and let me approach it from that direction. The Canadian criminal code details pretty well where a person is going to serve his or her sentence. Any sentence of x number of years or less is served in the state system. Any crime that is over x number of years is served in the federal system. Since there is a system there, they can better plan programs (whether they are going to be long term or short term). The Canadians also know that inmates serving short sentences will be fairly close to their own home communities. Those serving the longer sentences in the federal system are usually shipped away. This assists in transition of state inmates. They also have institutions for short-termers and long-termers. In short then, the Canadians have advantages of being able to plan. In our system—in the federal system and in the Ohio system and in other state systems—it is very difficult to plan. It is extremely difficult to plan for the population. I suspect that in Ohio, where the inmate population increased from 7,000 to 13,000 in five years, officials spent most of their time trying to find beds. Consider the following illustration. I mentioned to you that the inmate population in the federal system went from 24,000 to 31,000 during 1973-1978. I have been away about fifteen months and it has dropped to 26,000. Now all the predictors, including the Congressional Budget Office and the President's Budget Office, predicted that the population would exceed 33,000 inmates today. What happened? One very simple thing happened. We got a new Attorney General, and we got a new head of the FBI. They decided they were not going to go after bank robbers and car thieves to the same extent they were going to go after white collar criminals. In

going after white collar crime it takes two or three years to solve a case. It takes many people, many specialists. Consequently, there has been a big drop in the number of bank robbers and other people who were coming into the federal system, but far more are going into state systems. Canada does better planning than we do. The coordination between national and state policy is much better than in the United States. Canada has more like one system while the United States has several hundred systems.

Question: Are they better staffed?

Probably not better staffed, but there is far more attention paid to the development of staff in Canada than in most of our country. For instance, it's very easy for an officer in the Canadian system to get a sabbatical for further study. I doubt that any correction officers in Ohio have been granted a sabbatical in the last ten years. Training in the United States has been a luxury, not a requirement. The Bureau of Prisons has in recent years developed a quality training program. Several states also have but they are largely dependent on federal funds; thus, they are the first thing to go when funds are cut.

Question: What are the essential elements of a good staff development program? Along with this, what are some of the critical questions we should consider in a research study on staff development in corrections?

This center has been very active in the staff development area for vocational educators. One of the things that is absolutely needed in a staff development effort is to help vocational educators do systems planning, taking into consideration the framework in which they work. Most of the models that are operating in prisons are taken directly out of the high schools. There is an absolute need for systems planning to implement more effectively vocational education models within the framework of a prison. The research that needs to be conducted should consider the following: what training programs are appropriate for a prison setting; what occupations are open to ex-offenders; how can prison facilities be built for flexibility so they can accommodate changes in our society. There are a number of industrial operations that were built with good intentions. If you build a welding shop it will be around for awhile. They still supply the same technical training now as they did thirty years ago and that training is now irrelevant and wasted. Research needs to be done on the trades and the skills of the future and how to plan for those within the prison framework.

Question: Unless we reduce the turnover rates of correctional staff, won't our training efforts be futile?

There isn't as much turnover in the vocational education side as there is in the corrections officer side. Most staff loss is at the corrections officer level. Because of opportunities in corrections, it is seen as a good career for educators. Our country has increased staff as populations have increased. Thus, opportunities for professionals have been good.

Question: One of our big problems with staff turnover is that staff have a tendency to "burn-out," particularly professional staff. I think our vocational teachers, who teach six hours a day, five days a week, twelve months out of the year, and punch the clock going in, begin to feel the syndrome of being locked up. A number of our teachers that have left the system and gone to public schools say, "I'm out, I'm released." And it is this type of feeling that affects a lot of professionals. Don't you agree?

Yes, but it doesn't need to be this way. I am not a criminologist. I am an educational psychologist by training, and I started out in 1967 going to the Atlanta Federal Penitentiary working with officers in counseling skills. I found corrections more open to change than educational institutions. It really is—it is very open to change. If somebody has an idea, people are willing to try it. Staff interchange, training opportunities, reducing specialties of management and increasing opportunities for general management are a few ways to reduce "burn-out."

Question: Recent newspaper articles have reported the inadequacies of correctional facilities for women. Would you address this issue?

It is true. The women have been neglected. Institutions and administrations have been dominated by men. If ever there has been unequal treatment it has been in the difference between men's institutions and women's institutions. Usually the women's insititutions are located in worse facilities. In general, vocational programs have been so traditional in women's institutions. The point you refer to is accurate. It has only been recently that women's facilities and programs have been called to the public attention. The Department of Justice and American Correctional Association have recently commissioned task forces to study women in corrections. The number of women offenders stayed very stable for a long period of time. In the last five years, however, it has really increased.

Question: As we consider the intent of vocational training, the real results, and impinging societal factors, what is the best indicator of success of a vocational training program?

The best indicator is whether a person receives and holds a job. These indicators are a result of two factors, i.e., skill and work habits. I am not at all justifying the practice of installing license plates factories for the sole purpose of developing work habits. However, work habits are as important as skills. Tying work habits to skills is the critical mix for success.

LEADERSHIP SERIES
IN VOCATIONAL AND CAREER EDUCATION

Barlow, Melvin. ***Implications from the History of Vocational Education***, 1976 (OC 15—$1.00).

Bell, Terrel H. ***The Place of Vocational Education in Higher Education: Implications for Education R&D***, 1976 (DL 4—$1.50).

Bell, Terrel H. and Hoyt, Kenneth B. ***Career Education: The U.S.O.E. Perspective***, 1974 (OC 4—$1.50).

Bottoms, James E. ***Implications of the New Vocational Education Legislation for Program Research and Development***, 1976 (OC 23—$1.75).

Buzzell, Charles H. ***Productivity: Implications for Vocational Education***, 1976 (OC 19—$1.00).

Clark, David L. ***Federal Policy in Educational Research and Development***, 1974 (OC 5—$1.50).

Clark, David L. ***Research and Development Productivity in Educational Organizations***, 1978 (OC 41—$2.20).

Cohen, Wilbur J. ***Needed Federal Policy in Education for Century III***, 1977 (OC 24—$1.90).

Cyphert, Frederick. ***Forces Affecting Program Development in Higher Education: Is Anyone Driving?*** 1975 (OC 11—$1.00).

Delacruz, Joseph B. ***Educational Programs for Native Americans: Implications for Vocational Education Research and Development***, 1978 (OC 40—$1.90).

Ellis, John. ***Vocational Education and Federal Priorities***, 1978 (OC 47—$1.90).

Ellis, Mary L. ***Vocational Education: The Future Is Now***, 1978 (OC 37—$1.90).

Evans, Rupert. ***Vocational Education R and D in the Past Decade: Implications for the Future***, 1976 (OC 18—$1.00).

Fallstrom, Charles M. ***The Changing Secondary Education Scene: Implications for Vocational Education Research and Development***, 1976 (OC 22—$1.75).

Gideonse, Hendrik. ***A Model for Educational Research and Development: 1985***, 1978 (OC 44—$2.20).

Ginzberg, Eli. ***Strategies for Education Reform***, 1972-73 (DL 1—$1.00).

Gleazer, Edmund J. ***View on Community and Junior College Education***, 1975 (OC 9—$1.00).

Goldhammer, Keith. ***Extending Career Education Beyond the Schoolhouse Walls***, 1974 (OC 3—$2.00).

Halperin, Samuel. ***Emerging Educational Policy Issues in the Federal City: A Report from Washington***, 1978 (OC 42—$2.20).

Herr, Edwin L. ***Work Focused Guidance for Youth in Transition: Some Implications for Vocational Education Research and Development***, 1978 (OC 43—$2.20).

Hicks, Laurabeth L. ***Programs of Guidance and Counseling Becoming of Age: Implications for Vocational Education R&D***, 197[illegible] (OC 25—$1.75).

Hoyt, Kenneth B. ***Career Education, Vocational Education, and Occupational Education: An Approach to Defining Differences***, 1973-74 (DL 2—$1.25).

Jennings, John F. and Radcliffe, Charles W. ***Commentary on Legislation Affecting Vocational Education Research and Development***, 1977 (OC 27—$1.90).

Kolstoe, Oliver P. ***Implications of Research Findings on Vocational and Career Education for the Mentally Handicapped***, 1977 (OC 33—$1.90).

Kottman, Roy M. ***Building a Constituency for Research and Development***, 1975 (OC 10—$1.00).

Krathwohl, David. ***Improving Educational Research and Development***, 1976 (OC 21—$2.20).

Kreitlow, Burton W. ***Trends in Adult Education with Implications for Vocational Education***, 1976 (OC 13—$1.25).

Kruger, Daniel H. ***Occupational Preparation Programs: Implications for Vocational Education***, 1977 (OC 31—$1.90).

Levitan, Sar A. ***The Unemployment Numbers Is the Message***, 1977 (OC 38—$1.90).

McCage, Ronald D. ***The Development of a Comprehensive State Capacity for Program Improvement***, 1978 (OC 34—$1.75).

McCune, Shirley D. ***The Organized Teaching Profession and R&D***, 1977 (OC 29—$1.90).

Marland, Sidney P. ***Career Education: Retrospect and Prospect***, 1974-75 (DL 3—$2.00).

Martin, Edwin. ***New Directions in Vocational Education for the Handicapped: Implications for Research and Devleopment***, 1978 (OC 35—$1.75).

Moody, Tom. ***Vocational Education, CETA, and Youth Unemployment: Meeting the Needs of Inner City Youth,*** 1979 (OC 50—$1.75).

Parnes, Herbert S. ***A Conceptual Framework for Human Resource Policy: Implications for Vocational Education Research and Development***, 1976 (OC 14—$1.00).

Petty, Reginald. ***Trends and Issues in Vocational Education: Implications for Vocational Education Research and Development***, 1978 (OC 46—$1.90).

Pucinski, Roman. ***The Role of State and Local Advisory Councils in Vocational Education***, 1978 (OC 36—$1.90).

Reider, Corinne H. ***Women, Work and Vocational Education***, 1977 (OC 26—$1.90).

Rosen, Howard. ***Recent Manpower Legislation and Programs: Implications for Research and Development***, 1975 (OC 7—$1.00).

Scanion, Robert C. ***Public Schools for the 80's: Implications for Vocational and Career Education R&D***, 1976 (OC 20—$1.50).

Siffin, William. ***Institutional Building in Technical Assistance: The Design Perspective and Some Implications for Research and Development in Vocational Education***, 1975 (OC 8—$1.00).

Simpson, Elizabeth J. ***The Home as a Learning Center for Vocational Development***, 1976 (OC 16—$1.00).

Sticht, Thomas G. ***Literacy and Vocational Competence***, 1978 (OC 39—$2.80).

Wallace, Bertran F. ***Desegregation and Its Implications for Vocational and Career Education***, 1977 (OC 30—$1.75).

Wills, Joan. ***Youth Unemployment: Implications for Vocational Education R&D***, 1977 (OC 32—$1.75).

Wirtz, Willard R. and Ford, Gerald R. ***Bringing the World of Work and the Institutions of Education Closer Together***, 1977 (OC 28—$1.75).

Wirtz, Willard R. ***Community Education Work Councils***, 1976 (OC 17—$1.00).

ORDERING INFORMATION

All prices include postage and handling. When ordering use series numbers and titles. Orders of $10.00 or less will be accepted on a cash, check, or money order basis only. Purchase orders will be accepted for orders in excess of $10.00. Please make check or money order payable to: **The National Center for Research in Vocational Education**. Mail remittance and/or purchase order to: National Center Publications, The Ohio State University, 1960 Kenny Road, Columbus, OH 43210. (Prices subject to change.)